REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Claims 1, 4, 5, 7, 10-12, 14 and 18-22 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 4, 5, 12 and 21 are independent. By this Amendment, the independent claims are amended. Support for the amendments can be found, for example, in paragraph [0053] of the published U.S. application. No new matter is added.

Claims 1, 4, 5, 10, 12, 18 and 20-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Nakagiri et al. ("Nakagiri"), U.S. Patent No. 6,616,359, in view of Brown et al. ("Brown"), U.S. Patent No. 6,246,485, and further in view of Shima et al. ("Shima"), U.S. Patent No. 6,104,489. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent Claims 1, 5, 12 and 21 are amended to recite, *inter alia*, modifying multiple items of a default setting to create a modified default setting based on a single default setup command included in a printing job, and storing the modified default setting in a memory of a printing device by updating the default setting previously stored in the memory so that the modified default setting is available after printing test print image data. Independent Claim 4 is amended to recite similar features.

The April 3, 2009 Official Action and the Advisory Action maintain that Nakagiri's field 1002, which stores job setup in formation, contains instructions for modifying a default setup, such as field 1105 which stores printer finishing information (see col. 16, lines 32, 33 and 63-66 of Nakagiri). However, Nakagiri discloses that the job setup information stored in field 1002 is information *unique to each job* (see col. 16, lines 33 and 34). That is, the job setup information stored in

field 1002 is only temporary for that specific job. In other words, Nakagiri teaches that a print job can be printed using settings that are different than the default settings of a printer by *temporarily* changing the settings for the printing *of that one print job*. Indeed, both the April 3, 2009 Official Action and the Advisory Action acknowledge that Nakagiri's change in default settings is only temporary (see page 2 of the Official Action and comment 11 in the Advisory Action). The independent claims here have been amended to carefully distinguish between printing a print job using settings that are different than the default settings of a printer by temporarily changing the settings for the printing of that one print job compared to modifying the default settings of the printer and storing the modified default setting in a memory of a printing device so that the modified default setting is available after printing test print image data.

Brown discloses a printer communication system having a printer controller 34 that communicates with a host computer 10 using the Network Printer Alliance Protocol ("NPAP") (see col. 5, line 65 to col. 6, line 1 of Brown). Brown discloses that a NPAP Task device 54 handles the NPAP communication (see Fig. 3 and col. 6, lines 10-12 of Brown). The April 3, 2009 Official Action takes the position that the NPAP Task device 54 is a default setup modifying unit. However, the NPAP Task device 54 simply supplies printer status information to any locally attached and/or network attached host computers 10, and receives requests for such information from the host computers 10 (see col. 6, lines 14-17 of Brown). The NPAP Task device 54 does not modify multiple items of a default setting to create a modified default setting based on a single default setup command included in a printing job, and store the modified default setting in a memory of a printing device by overwriting

Thus, neither Nakagiri nor Brown discloses or suggests modifying multiple items of a default setting to create a modified default setting based on a single default setup command included in a printing job, and storing the modified default setting in a memory of a printing device by updating the default setting previously stored in the memory so that the modified default setting is available after printing test print image data, as recited in independent Claims 1, 5, 12 and 21 and similarly recited in independent claim 4. Further, Shima fails to cure the deficiencies of Nakagiri and Brown. Thus, independent Claims 1, 4, 5, 12 and 21 are patentable over the combination of Nakagiri, Brown and Shima for at least the above reasons.

Claims 10, 18 and 20, 22 are patentable over the applied references at least by virtue of their respective dependence from patentable independent Claims 1, 4, 5 and 12. Thus, a detailed discussion of the additional distinguishing features recited in these dependent claims is not set forth at this time. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects Claims 7, 11, 14 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Nakagiri in view of Brown and Shima, and further in view of Iguchi, U.S. Patent No. 6,963,414. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 7, 11, 14 and 19 are patentable over the applied references at least by virtue of their respective dependence from patentable independent Claims 1, 4, 5 and 12. Thus, a detailed discussion of the additional distinguishing features recited in these dependent claims is not set forth at this time. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Attorney's Docket No. 1011350-000325 Application No. 10/705,844 Page 11

Should any questions arise in connection with this application or should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference with the undersigned would be helpful in resolving any remaining issues pertaining to this application the undersigned respectfully requests that he be contacted at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: September 3, 2009

David R. Kemeny

By:

Régistration No. 57241

P.O. Box 1404 Alexandria, VA 22313-1404 703 836 6620